



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,823	08/08/2001	Gregory P. Fitzpatrick	BOC9-2000-0083(218)	2585

7590 06/30/2004

Gregory A. Nelson
Akerman Senterfitt
222 Lakeview Avenue, Fourth Floor
P.O. Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

EHICHIOYA, FRED I

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

h

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,823

Applicant(s)

FITZPATRICK ET AL.

Examiner

Fred I. Ehichioya

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on (telephonic communication) 06/08/2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 - 7, 19, 21 - 25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3 - 7, 19, 21 - 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office Action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

However, after subsequent search, it was found that Flake teaches "responsive to a triggering condition that identifies at least one of plurality of related records (see column 8, lines 33 – 47), selectively purging non-identified related records of said set from single table (see column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 49), a limitation of claims 2 and 20 that was previously objected to as allowable subject matter. Therefore, the rejection of the last Office Action is proper.

Claim Objections

2. The objection to claims 2 and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, that would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims is hereby withdrawn as a result of the cited reasons above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 19, 21, 22 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,978,770 issued to Waytena et al (Hereinafter "Waytena") in view of USPN 5,832,451 issued to Flake et al (hereinafter "Flake").

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Waytena teaches in a relational database management system (RDBMS), a method of processing related records comprising:

receiving a plurality of related records (see Fig.2D and column 10, lines 4 – 20);
inserting said plurality of related records into a single table of an RDBMS (see column 10, lines 63 – 67 and column 23, lines 40 – 67); and
responsive to a triggering condition, selectively purging particular related records of said set from said single table (see column 3, lines 23 – 55).

Waytena does not explicitly teach associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table using a published function of said RDBMS.

Flake teaches associating said plurality of related records as a set within said single table using a published function of said RDBMS (see column 8, lines 33 – 67); and

Flakes also teaches responsive to a triggering condition that identifies at least one of plurality of related records (see column 8, lines 43 – 47), selectively purging non-identified related records of said set from single table (see column 13, line 60 through column 14, line 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Flake with the teaching of Waytena wherein set of tasks or records are group together. These groups of related records are record in a queue or table that belong to a particular agent. The motivation is that associating the records makes it easy for a set of tasks to be easily identified. The unidentified records are easy to identify and remove from a queue set.

Regarding claims 3 and 21, Waytena teaches wherein said purging step purges each one of said plurality of related records (see column 3, lines 23 – 27).

Regarding claims 4 and 22, Waytena teaches wherein said table includes a data type for specifying said plurality of related records and said associating step further comprises assigning to each one of said plurality of related records a common identifier conforming with said data type, wherein said common identifier is unique to said set (see column 10, lines 21 – 30).

Regarding claims 7 and 25, Flake teaches said associating step further comprising:

associating selected records of said set as a subset wherein said particular related records of said purging step include at least one selected record of said subset (see column 8, lines 33 – 67 and column 9, lines 1 – 18).

5. Claims 5, 6, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waytena in view of Flake and further in view of USPN 5,499,359 issued to Narayanan Vijaykumar (hereinafter "Vijaykumar").

Regarding claims 5, and 23, Waytena and Flake disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed in claims 1 and 19 respectively.

Waytena or Flake does not explicitly teach disassociating selected records from said set responsive to a triggering condition.

Vijaykumar teaches disassociating selected records from said set responsive to a triggering condition (see column 9, lines 54 – 67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine teaching of Vijaykumar with the teaching of Waytena and Flake wherein some record are removed from the queue as a result some type of triggering event. The motivation is that disassociation removes all the child's records associated with parent record when the parent record is deleted.

Regarding claims 6 and 24, Vijaykumar teaches deleting throughout said RDBMS, records linked to said purged records using referential integrity rules (see column 17, lines 55 – 67).


Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fred I. Ehichioya whose telephone number is 703-305-8039. The examiner can normally be reached on M - F 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Fred I. Ehichioya
Examiner
Art Unit 2172
June 18, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER